UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/530,176	03/09/2006	Graham Edmund Kelly	Q86664	8060
23373 SUGHRUE MI	7590 11/02/200 ON, PLLC	EXAMINER		
2100 PENNSY	LVÁNIA AVENUE, N	PACKARD, BENJAMIN J		
SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20037			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1612	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/02/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/530,176	KELLY, GRAHAM EDMUND		
Examiner	Art Unit		

	Benjamin Packard	1612					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appea	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 09 October 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following reapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Claperiods:	eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance	, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request				
a) The period for reply expires 5 months from the mailing date of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ac no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)	lvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing o). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extender 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the state forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later that may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount on tened statutory period for reply originates.	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as				
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complifiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exten Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b (a) They raise new issues that would require further con (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belov (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bette appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a content of the second co	sideration and/or search (see NOTv); er form for appeal by materially rec	E below); lucing or simplifying th					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowed non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provious the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: 2. Claim(s) rejected: 1.3.4.8-10 and 23. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	See Continuation Sheet. bwable if submitted in a separate, t will not be entered, or b) wil	imely filed amendmer	it canceling the				
<u>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</u> 8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but	before or on the date of filing a No	otice of Appeal will not	be entered				
because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	sufficient reasons why the affidavi	t or other evidence is	necessary and				
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to ov showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	rercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	ll and/or appellant fails ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a				
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attache	ed.				
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u>							
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) 13. Other:							
/Frederick Krass/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1612	/Benjamin Packard/ Examiner, Art Unit 1612						

Continuation of 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): Claims 1-4, 6-10, 23, and 26-28 under 35 USC 112 first paragraph Written Description.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants' arguments, filed 10/09/09, have been fully considered. Rejections and/or objections not reiterated from previous office actions are hereby withdrawn. The following rejections and/or objections are either reiterated or newly applied. They constitute the complete set presently being applied to the instant application.

Claims rejection 35 USC 112 - Scope of Emablement

Claims 4 and 8-10 stand rejetced under USC 112 - scope of enablement.

Applicants assert the claims are limited to the working examples.

Examiner notes claim 4 includes the prophylaxis of cancer, which is not supported by the specification given the unpredictability in treating cancer.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1, 3-4, 8-10, and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kelly et al (WO98/008503) in view of Ekwurlbe et al (US 6,380,405).

Applicant asserts the amendments limit the claimed invention to only the embodiments showing synergistic results.

Examiner disagrees. Applicant's amendments do not limit the claims to the showing of synergy demonstrated by the instant specification. Specifically, Examiner notes pg 37 Table 1 illustrates synergistic effects for cisplatin and dehydroequol for the various cancer lines tested, but the additional combinations tested in Example 2 are limited to ovarian cancer cells. Where Applicant is claiming "synergistic effect", the results are by definition unpredictable. Therefore, the additional combinations of dehydroequol and carboplatin and paclitaxel appear to be limited to only the ovarian cancer cell lines tested, i.e. CP70 and A2780.

Obvious-Type Double Patenting

Claims 1, 3-4, 8-10, and 23 stand rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1-21 of U.S. Patent No. 6,649,648 in view of Ekwurlbe et al (US 6,380,405).

Applicant asserts the amendments limit the claimed invention to only the embodiments showing synergistic results.

Examiner disagrees with the showing of synergy for the reasons discussed above.

Claims 1, 3-4, 8-10, and 23 stand provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 13-38 of copending Application No. 10/547,077 in view of Ekwurlbe et al (US 6,380,405).

Applicant asserts because this case has the oldest filing date and no additional rejections remain, this rejection should be withdrawn.

Examiner disagrees. As discussed above, the rejections are maintained, therefore this rejection remains proper.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 2 stands objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, given it would not be expected that the combination of agents would cause sensitivity in cancer cells or tumor which was previous not sensitive to the anti-cancer agent, as discussed in the Office Action dated 05/12/09.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Benjamin Packard whose telephone number is 571-270-3440. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-5 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Frederick Krass can be reached on 571-272-0580. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If 2 you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact

you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.